

Store Closes To-Day at 1 P. M. (Employees' Half Holiday)

## Miller & Rhoads

Women's Skirts, Values up to \$4.98, now \$1.50

Two hundred Skirts, all high-class garments, this season's styles.

Black and Cream Voles, White Brilliantines, Novelties in stripes, checks and mixtures; Fancy Striped Tulle, Fine Pannam. All styles in the assortment and nearly all colors, with plenty of blacks. All sizes, and without doubt the greatest bargain event of the summer in Skirts that are desirable from every point of view—quality, fit and style. \$4.98

## \$5 Princess Dresses, \$2.90

One-piece Jumper Dresses, and beauties they are, in broken plaids and polka dots of navy, light blue, tan, also white grounds with lavender and light blue figures. Included in the assortment are a few White Dresses in two pieces.

Fresh, clean-looking Dresses, that when the time comes for laundering will do up beautifully.

## MORE LITIGATION OVER NEGRO PARK

Rholder Seeks Damages for Time He Was Forced to Live Elsewhere.

### CASE SENT TO NEXT TERM

Right of Colored People to Establish Pleasure Park Is Involved.

Joseph A. Rholder is still suing the People's Pleasure Park, the second suit for damages being instituted in the Henrico Circuit Court yesterday. This dispute, which has been on for about two years, grows out of the sale of the property known as Fulton Park to a negro corporation for the purpose of establishing a park.

At the time of the sale Rholder had a lease on the property, and he had permitted the negro purchasers to use it. He paid no attention to his objections, however, and moved in on the land in such numbers that there was no room for him. Thereupon he entered suit for damages, and when the case was heard was allowed damages only for the one year he had been out there being no allowance for the time which, in the terms of his lease, he had a right to use the property.

#### Negro Question Involved.

The present suit has been instituted for the recovery of damages for the interval between the day that Rholder moved away and the expiration of the lease, this suit being confined to the question of the right of the negroes to purchase this land, the case being appealed from the Circuit Court to the Supreme Court where the negroes won out on a technicality.

In 1900 Bliss Park of Boston, bought the property known as Fulton Park, with the intention of building up a white settlement there. He cut up the land into 1,000 building lots and advertised them for sale, stating that the deeds would be made to the negroes could ever get possession of land in that district. Accordingly, it was stipulated that the transfer of the land should be made to the negroes, and the condition that the title should never vest in a negro or person of African descent.

Between 1900 and 1906 the land changed hands several times, but was still under control of Black, the transfers having been made between members of the same family. The condition had, however, been preserved, though it was probably the wish of Black to get rid of it.

#### Sold for Colored Park.

Eventually the holders of the land decided to sell the property to a negro corporation to be used for purposes of amusement and to be known as the People's Pleasure Park. The white people who lived on that land and adjoining streets, and the negroes, and on the ground of the provision in the deeds that the property should not get into the possession of a colored person, they sought to show that the latter had no right to purchase it.

This matter finally went to the Supreme Court, and was decided there in favor of the negroes composing the corporation, it being the opinion of the court that a corporation is a separate entity and that the provision in the deed making it impossible for the title to vest in a negro had not been violated.

### BADLY TREATED HORSE

Court Imposes Sterner Penalty on Three Negroes Convicted of Ill-Treatment.

George Lewis, Fred Boston and William Taylor, all colored, were fined \$20 each in the Police Court yesterday morning on a charge of cruelly treating a horse suffering with a sore back. They had been arrested by the police on a charge of cruelty to animals, who stated that he found the men riding in a buggy drawn by a horse in the lot of a colored man, the animal having to be sent to the happy hunting grounds.

The severest penalty imposed by the statute for such offenses is \$100 fine, or twelve months in jail, or both. Heretofore the court has been lenient, but in the case of Crutcher raised it to double, or \$200.

### HOUSE SOLD FOR \$12,000

H. B. Powell Acquires Property at No. 103

Deeds were recorded in the Chancery Court yesterday as follows: Fannie Nelson Jones to Hugh B. Powell, the house and lot No. 103 East Grace Street, for \$12,000.

A. C. Denoon to George W. Davis, the house and lot No. 103 East Grace Street, for \$12,000.

M. E. Northington to Hugh M. Taylor, the house and lot No. 103 East Grace Street, for \$12,000.

## WROTE LETTER TO WIFE, THEN DIED

W. N. Downes, of Richmond, Expires Suddenly in Roanoke Hotel.

### HAD SAID GOOD-BY TO SON

Left Him at Train and Started to Johnson City to Enter Sanatorium.

Ten minutes after writing a letter to his wife here, Mr. W. N. Downes, of this city, was taken with hemorrhage in the Eureka House, at Roanoke, yesterday, dying within a few moments. He had been in bad health for some time, and had been staying in the Eureka House, at Roanoke, for the last few days.

Mr. Downes arrived in Roanoke from Salem yesterday morning. He put his son on the train for Richmond at 1:15 o'clock, and died shortly after 4. It was his intention to leave Roanoke for a sanatorium at Johnson City, Tenn.

His body will arrive here to-day. No arrangements for the funeral can be made until his relatives in different parts of the country can be heard from.

#### Served in Federal Army.

Mr. Downes was born in Kent county, Del., December 6, 1843, being the son of Dr. J. Morton Downes. At the age of sixteen he enlisted in the Second Delaware Battery, and afterwards he enlisted, joining the Tenth Maryland Infantry. After the war he lived in Ohio, where he was a prominent member of the G. A. R.

He was married twice, first to Miss Nellie E. Downes, who died in October, 1871. By this marriage he had three children—Mr. Arthur W. Downes and Mrs. Edgar Waltz, of Acton, Ohio, and Mrs. William Waltz, of Cleveland.

In 1898 he was married to Miss Clara Kimball, of Virginia, who died in 1900. The son who was with him shortly before his death, is the only child of his second marriage.

Besides his children he leaves two brothers—Dr. J. F. Downes and Mr. O. C. Downes, of Baltimore, Md., and a sister, Mrs. J. F. Downes, who has lived here for about nine years.

### WANTS HUTZLER STAND

Saloonekeeper Asking Consent of Nearby Property Owners on Broad.

Charles D. Hutzler's saloon, at No. 603 East Broad Street, closed under the new regulations allowing only 150 barrooms in the city, may be opened again, this time by the proprietors of Doyle's saloon, heretofore located at the corner of Seventh and Broad.

The Doyle and Thompson places, on opposite corners of Broad Street, were closed by order of the court upon the petition of the police, who stated that the place was a nuisance, and that the proprietors, who objected because they had to wait on that corner for their cars, it never was proved that any actual harm was done by the saloon, and the proprietors of each place have been immediately to look for new quarters.

Mr. Thompson was preparing to open at Custal's old place, next to Doyle's, and had carpenters rearranging the interior when the building toppled in. That ended the matter for him, for the present anyway, and he suggested that he might as well get a new place. He was driven by the court from his present position and by fate from his prospective location.

The Doyle people got the idea of opening in Hutzler's old stand, and have asked property owners on the block to give their consent. It is not believed that they will be any more successful in this regard, as none was ever made to the location of the bar. It was closed for other reasons.

#### Only One Charter.

The Corporation Commission issued a charter yesterday to The Daily Record Company (Inc.), Richmond, W. H. Merriam, president; J. M. Merriam, secretary and treasurer; T. D. Parrish, all of Richmond. Capital: Maximum, \$100,000. Minimum, \$500. Objects: Printing business.

#### Failed to Have License.

Sadie Hobson and Sadie Howard (colored) were arrested yesterday morning on a charge of selling liquor without a license. He fined them each \$200 and in default of payment they were committed to the city jail for ten days.

The Hobson woman appealed, and was bailed in the sum of \$500. The case was worked up by Bicycle Officers Wiley and Palmer.

## FARMERS COMING FROM ALL POINTS

Institute Officers Expect Attendance to Reach 2,000 Mark.

### HOW THE ORDER HAS GROWN

Started Five Years Ago With Two Dozen Members at Roanoke.

Practically all arrangements have been completed for the entertainment of the Virginia State Farmers' Institute, which convenes at the Jefferson Hotel on Tuesday next. From reports received by the officers, it is estimated that about 2,000 members will attend, this list including the old members and others who will come this year prepared to join.

While the business sessions will continue for two days without interruption, the attractive feature will be the excursion to Curl's Neck farm, two steamers having been chartered to convey the visitors down the river to the wonderful plantations.

#### How Institute Has Grown.

The growth of the institute is regarded as a striking evidence of the interest displayed by Virginia farmers in all questions pertaining to agricultural questions and problems. Five years ago the first session was held in Roanoke, with about two dozen farmers in attendance, but the little band was satisfied that the organization would grow, and be of great usefulness to the people.

Last year of Professor Soule's connection with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and Virginia Experiment Station, at Blacksburg. This small beginning did not discourage the officers, and a constitution and by-laws having been adopted, they went actively to work for the next annual meeting. At this first meeting Hon. J. Hoge Tyler, ex-Governor of Virginia, was elected president; Professor A. M. Soule, secretary, and J. M. Williams, assistant secretary.

When the second year's meeting came around, the attendance had grown to about 500. This gave the officers encouragement, and no expense was spared to get the very best speakers obtainable. A free excursion to Blacksburg to visit the experiment station, an attractive feature, was provided, and the program was printed and sent broadcast over the State, and this created a deep interest. The same officers were re-elected.

The third year was a repetition of the second, with an attendance of about 800, and the year the same officers were re-elected.

Last year, the fourth, the attendance went to about 1,200, and the membership to nearly 1,000. Professor Soule having resigned from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, with the intention of going to Georgia, he resigned as secretary, and Mr. J. Lucien Moomaw, of Cloverdale, was elected secretary and treasurer in his stead.

Governor Tyler, having given long and faithful service as president, also stepped to be relieved, and in his place Mr. O. Sandy, of Burkeville, was elected. J. M. Williams, the assistant secretary, is the only active officer with an unbroken record of service in behalf of the farmers of Virginia.

### PRISONER WAS WHIPPED

Henrico Magistrate Delegates Father to Punish Boy.

Percy Johnson, the ten-year-old negro boy who was placed in the county jail Saturday night, charged with robbing a day laborer, was tried yesterday morning before Judge Preston.

The magistrate found the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On account of the absence of certain important witnesses for the defendant, the case of Fred Taylor, charged with the murder of a negro, was continued until Saturday.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

On Saturday morning the boy guilty of felonious intent, but owing to his youthfulness dismissed the case, requiring the boy's father to pay him a fine of \$100 and the costs of the action.

\$18.00 to \$25.00 Suits Now \$8.75  
\$13.50 to \$16.50 Suits Now \$7.00

All small and broken lots are included in this sale—all sizes from 33 to 46 chest measure, in one style or another.

## Gans-Radt Company

## RETAILERS ALONE CAN ENTER DRY TERRITORY

Brewers and Wholesalers Not Permitted to Ship Into Prohibition Towns, Says Commission.

In an opinion handed down yesterday the State Corporation Commission reaffirmed its former ruling in the Southwest Virginia liquor case, refusing to reopen it on petition of the Rose and Porter Brewing Company of Alexandria. Because the Southern Express Company declined to accept shipments of liquor to points along the line of the Norfolk and Western railway, which had passed ordinances to prohibit such traffic, Roanoke dealers applied to the commission for an order requiring the express company to receive and transport packages. Being a common carrier it was ordered to place the liquor in its cars, and the order specified that brewers, wholesalers and distillers could not come in on the same basis. In other words, retail dealers could ship, though wholesale houses were debarred from sending their product in bulk to dry towns.

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."

The position of the commission is set forth in the following opinion: "The Robert Porter Brewing Company has filed a petition for a rehearing in this matter, suggesting that the commission error in its judgment in this proceeding in enjoining and prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Rose and Porter Brewing Company, in Alexandria, Va., which license is located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory, and thus make a discrimination in favor of the manufacturer of liquor located in no-license territory."